DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 028 HE 006 962

AUTHOR	Gordon, Edmund W.
TITLE	Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6, 1975.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RR-6
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	35p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; College Students; *Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Development; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Needs; *Equal Education; Federal Programs; *Higher Education; Institutional Role; Program Evaluation; Remedial Programs; State Programs; *Student Needs; Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

Numerous federal, state, and institutional projects have been undertaken in the areas of current educational opportunity programs for the disadvantaged, but there is still a need to bring about significant changes in the areas of administration, curriculum, program evaluation, and financial assistance. The state of compensatory education at the college level and the equivocal status of evaluation efforts is confused, but some conclusions can still be drawn. Where programs have been implemented with full systems of student support services, special opportunity students showed equal or higher grade-point averages than regular students of comparable ability, equal or higher retention rates, and increased self-esteem and motivation. Where special opportunity students are selected on the basis of previously demonstrated talent, college completion rates exceed those of the traditional college population. Some student support services that show promise include: full systems of student support services, services that provide protection from an impersonal atmosphere, remedial courses based on specific needs, programs which give attention to the sociopolitical life of the students, behavior modification, course content that complements the nationalistic concerns of students, developmental programs in test taking and study habits, and programs that prepare adolescents in the transition from high school to college. (Author/KE)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

Already Published in the Series

1. Educational Auditing and Voluntary Institutional Accrediting
   Fred F. Harcleroad and Frank G. Dickey

2. Academic Credit for Prior Off-Campus Learning
   David A. Trivett

3. Experiential Education: A Conceptual Review
   Robert F. Sexton and Richard A. Ungerer

4. Federal Laws: Nondiscrimination and Faculty Employment
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

5. Emerging Sources of Student Influence
   Samuel E. Kellams

To subscribe to the complete series of 1975 reports (10 issues), write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036. The subscription rate for AAHE members is $15, for nonmembers $25. Single issues are available at $3 per copy.

ED114028

Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education

Edmund W. Gordon

ERIC/Higher Education
Research Report No. 6
1975

Prepared by the
ERIC Clearinghouse
on Higher Education
The George Washington University
Washington, D. C. 20036

Published by
the American Association
for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D. C. 20036

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 010 962

Acknowledgement

The author wishes to thank Kimberly Fahrer for her assistance during the preparation of this report.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Association for Higher Education for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions do not, however, necessarily represent official views or opinions of either the American Association for Higher Education or the National Institute of Education.

Foreword

This study examines current educational opportunity programs for the disadvantaged in terms of institutional response, the studies of this response, and the status of evaluation of these programs. It is suggested that while numerous federal, state, and institutional projects have been undertaken, there is still a need to bring about significant changes in the areas of administration, curriculum, program evaluation, and financial assistance. The author identifies several program elements that show promise of being useful in the implementation of educational opportunity programs. Edmund G. Gordon is director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education and chairman of and professor in the Department of Applied Human Development and Guidance at Teacher's College, Columbia University.

Peter P. Muirhead, Director
ERIC/Higher Education

Contents

Overview 1
Historical Framework 1
The New Student 4
Federal, State and Institutional Responses 6
Admissions 7
Finance 9
Curriculum 11
Outcomes 15
Conclusions 20
Bibliography 23

Overview

In recent years several hundred thousand persons have enrolled in American institutions of higher education—persons who previously were denied access to college because of "limitations": socioeconomic status, ethnicity, poor elementary and secondary experience, and previous academic performance records. To accommodate these new students, many public and private institutions (in addition to those which historically have enrolled black students) have initiated special programs. The programs differ in practice and depth of commitment but all have responded to the demand to provide a successful post-secondary educational experience for a heterogeneous population of new students with needs and characteristics quite different from those of the American college student in the past.

This paper will describe current educational opportunity programs by considering: ways in which various institutions have responded to demands to serve disadvantaged populations and the difficulties encountered; selected studies and institutions in terms of their programs and the components that seem to indicate both progress and error; and the status of evaluation of these programs. The results of this survey suggest that, although numerous programs and practices encompassing various aspects of the higher education process (administration, curriculum, assessment, finance) have been initiated, as yet they have brought about little or no essential change in the overall process. Furthermore, despite the considerable amount of activity in collegiate compensatory education, there has been little systematic evaluative research. As noted elsewhere (Gordon 1972a), the best available data concerning educational attainment and college attendance by disadvantaged students are for Afro-Americans, who are the largest and most frequently studied disadvantaged population; underclass whites have not yet received much attention.

Historical Framework

One could preface the description of current practices by saying that American higher education has aspired to the democratic ideal of full equality in educational opportunity for every citizen, in part failing to attain this ideal, in part realizing it. The early colleges were contrived for the well-born; yet even prior to the Civil War, public pressure had brought about the founding of a number of col-

leges to educate the children on the lower strata. Most of these were created by state governments and most were supported by the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 (Cornell 1962). The City University of New York, founded in 1849 as the Free Academy, has been, since its inception, tuition-free (Irwin 1961). Although these institutions were created to increase access to higher education for all Americans, certain groups continued to be excluded. Women were first admitted on an equal basis with men at Oberlin College, which opened in 1833 (Irwin 1961). However, minority groups were shamefully underrepresented. Although institutions specifically for blacks were created (what is now Cheyney State College, Pa.; Lincoln University, Pa.; Wilberforce University, Ohio), usually by philanthropic or religious organizations, few higher educational opportunities existed for blacks in relation to their numbers (Pifer 1973). While total undergraduate enrollment was increasing steadily—from 232,000 in 1899 to 1,396,000 in 1939 (Cartter 1965)—the total number of blacks who received baccalaureate degrees during that same period increased only from 1,200 to 9,005, an insignificant figure indicative of limited access.

Aside from social/ethnic factors, inability to pay was the greatest limitation affecting higher educational access until the Second World War. The end of that war brought with it the Serviceman's Readjustment Act (the G.I. Bill) and a massive influx of new college students. Approximately three million persons were able to attend college under this provision. Between 1946 and 1948 roughly half of all American college students were receiving benefits as veterans (Armstrong 1959). The G.I. Bill was never intended to enable the poor to attend college, but rather to reward citizens for serving their country; still, to this day, the act remains a critical financial aid to a large number of disadvantaged students (veterans and their families).

By the 1950's a substantial number of Americans had attained access to postsecondary education. Those left out were those who had always been left out—the poor, and especially the minorities. In the case of Brown v. Board of Education, 1954, Justice Marshall declared that segregation "generates a feeling of inferiority as to . . . status in the community that may affect . . . hearts and minds in a way never likely to be undone . . . Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal" (quoted in Pifer 1973, p. 24). This decision heralded a renewal of hope—for minorities if not the poor in general—that the democratization of American education, implicitly including higher education, could more nearly approach a reality.

Significant events ensued. The post-sputnik national concern brought about the National Defense Education Act in 1958—the

first instance of widely available federal loans for college that were awarded partly on the basis of need. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations' promises of equal opportunity, finding fulfillment in many areas, might be symbolized best in higher education by James Meredith's admission to the University of Mississippi, the last totally segregated institution of higher education. (Pifer 1973). During this period, when college students who had been active in civil rights work elsewhere began to look at conditions on their own campuses, a great many colleges and universities took steps to make a place for minorities and other historically underrepresented groups. This movement was aided substantially by measures taken by the federal government. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, under Title VI, required that for federal monies to be allocated, institutions of higher education must submit enrollment figures according to ethnic breakdown, which was indicative of efforts to diversify the student population. The Higher Education Act of 1965 incorporated a number of programs—Supplemental Opportunity Grants, College Work Study, Talent Search, Upward Bound—that were designed as direct or indirect help to disadvantaged/minority students.

Frequently, individual institutions took an elitist stance, seeking out minority students who would present the least risk to their standards (Gordon 1972a; Astin 1972; Wing and Wallach 1971; Thresher 1966; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966). However, other institutions took a more democratic approach. The City University of New York (CUNY), in many ways an exemplar for the entire country, began its SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation and Knowledge) program at several campuses as early as 1966 (New York State 1973; Dispenzieri 1969b). This program represented one of the first attempts (not including black colleges) to admit students without an academic screening process—the policy of taking students from where they are academically to quality higher education through a variety of culturally sensitive practices and services.

Then came the chaotic social climate of the mid 1960's, epitomized by the death of Martin Luther King in 1967 and the attendant public reaction, which forced colleges to respond quickly to disadvantaged populations (College Entrance Examination Board [CEEB] 1973; Astin 1972; Gordon 1972a). The well-publicized, violent campus incidents made clear to administrators the critical, immediate need for change in the higher education establishment. Although many institutions had initiated special programs for the disadvantaged by the end of the 1960's and had reformed their recruiting emphases accordingly, the national situation in 1970 showed much still had to

be done (CEEB 1973; Astin 1972). For example, acccording to 1970 census data (U.S. Department of Commerce 1970), 21 percent of white persons ages 16 to 24 had completed at least two years of college and 9 percent had completed four; for blacks of this age span 9 percent had completed two years and 3 percent four. More revealing, approximately 62 percent of white persons 17 to 24 were enrolled in college in 1970 (evenly divided between upper and lower divisions); the figure for blacks enrolled in college is 34 percent; and for Spanish Americans 35 percent. However, of these latter two categories, twice as many students were in the lower divisions.

For equivalent representation to be evident in postsecondary enrollment statistics, places for approximately a half million additional persons from the minorities mentioned would have to be found (Crossland 1971). These figures do not include other minorities. Furthermore, they do not include the role of income in determining the concentration of whites in the survey. (See the Urban Ed, Inc. (1974) report for comprehensive enrollment data.)

The trend since these figures were generated shows increasing numbers of previously underrepresented populations seeking postsecondary education (CEEB 1973), while the 18 to 24 age group as a whole was increasing along with the percentage of high school graduates attending college. The CEEB report tabulates percentages of 18 to 24 year olds enrolled in college in 1970 by income level as follows: bottom quarter, 19.6 percent; second quarter, 33.1 percent; third quarter, 44.6 percent; top quarter, 59.9 percent. Nevertheless, the growth of financial aid entitlement programs, led by the Federal Basic Opportunity Grants program and more than 40 state grant programs, nearly all need-based (*Higher Education*, 1975), significantly increased opportunities for the disadvantaged in higher education.

The New Student

More and more institutions are admitting nontraditional students who bring to the campus characteristics very different from their traditional student counterparts. In terms of educational needs, the nontraditional student

> has not acquired the verbal, mathematical, and full range of cognitive skills required for collegiate level work. Generally, he is a student whose grades fall in the bottom half of his high school class, who has not earned a (college preparatory) diploma, and is assigned to a high school which has a poor record for student achievement or who has been tracked into a general, commercial or vocational high school program. . . . Such a student will generally rank low on such traditional measures of collegiate admissions as the SAT board scores, high school average class standing, or (state) examination (U.S. Department of Commerce 1970).

These "new" students come from a variety of ethnic groups and from subcultures within those groups; in some cases English is not their primary language. Almost inevitably they have been victimized by inferior school systems and, in addition to lacking academic skills, they are wary of formal school situations. They share a common poverty and concomitant feelings of impotence (McGrath 1966; Crossland 1971; Pifer 1973).

Federal, State and Institutional Responses

The New York State Regents have said, "We assume that persons of the various ethnic and racial groups in our society aspire to and are capable of obtaining all the various levels of educational achievement in approximately the same proportions. Such is not the case because social conditions have made the attainment of these various levels more difficult for some sectors of the population" (New York State Department of Education 1975, p. 10). One would think the amelioration of this inequitable situation should be one of this society's greatest concerns.

In some measure society has responded, but higher education's commitment to programs for disadvantaged students varies greatly. Astin (1972) describes a "pyramidical system . . . roughly composed of three groups: a few prestigious and wealthy institutions that, in fact, enroll only high achievers; a large number of 'middle' colleges that enroll a somewhat more diverse but still select student clientele; and a mass of small four-year colleges and public and private two-year colleges that enroll students whose achievement has been undistinguished (p. 3, 4). The validity of this model is supported by literature pertaining to the base of this pyramid—which centainly would include black colleges, community colleges, and nonselective four-year colleges.

Coleman (1966) reported the existence of two sets of colleges, one 98 percent black, the other 98 percent white. In the mid 1960's approximately 50 percent of black college students were enrolled in predominately black colleges (Gordon 1972a), an improvement (some would think, others would not) over approximately 66 percent in the 1950's (Jaffe 1968). The idea of the black college has been subject to controversy and its legality questioned (see Pifer 1973; Cheek 1972; Bowles 1971; Jaffe 1968; Jencks 1967 for differing views). The black college has been criticized harshly. An extremely negative view is presented by Jencks and Riesman (1967) who consider the black college far too narrowly focused (on teacher training and vocational training) and frequently dedicated to white middle-class values. Jaffe (1968) has criticized the quality of education at most black colleges. Others (Crossland, McGrath), while admitting weaknesses, view the black colleges more positively, sensing their value with better planning and greater financial support. An extremely positive view of the

role of the black college is presented by Cheek (1972). He asserts that since equal opportunity in higher education has not become a reality, the burden of opportunity must be borne by the black college. The black college can be the vehicle through which blacks can gain dignity and self-respect as well as the professional means with which to share in the power structure of the country. In this way a greater number of blacks will be able to take a constructive part in a culturally pluralistic society and racism will be exposed.

Karabel (1973) reported that in 1973, one third of all students entering higher education entered through the doors of a community college (in California the figure is 80 percent). Further, he presents figures linking low socioeconomic status to enrollment in junior colleges. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents to the Gordon/Wilkerson (1966) survey that reported compensatory practices were two-year colleges. Controversy surrounds the idea of the junior or community college. Karabel deplores the tracking both into and within the junior college. The Center for Policy Research (1969) noted there are indications that some junior colleges may be more responsive to the affective needs of the disadvantaged student. Whatever its merit, the two-year college has been the subject of a considerable portion of the research in collegiate compensatory education (Baehr 1969; Karabel 1973; Losak 1971; Roueche 1968) and is a major force in higher education for the disadvantaged.

Finally, is is fairly well documented that disadvantaged students attend the least prestigious four-year colleges (Gordon 1972a; Kendrick 1965). Implications can be drawn from these statements regarding relationships between type and incidence of postsecondary enrollment and between socioeconomic status/ethnicity/prior educational experience and concomitant achievement level. These will become clearer upon closer examination of more specific practices in higher education in response to the need to serve diverse populations. Policy changes have occurred in three broad areas in the structure of higher education: admissions/recruitment, financial aid, and curriculum. The practical repsonses to the necessity for change in these areas will now be discussed along with the theoretical issues involved.

Admissions

During the 1950's much attention was given to the need for finding and developing America's human resources. There were some new developments in the area, notably the establishment of the National Merit Scholarship program in 1955 to select talented youth for

scholarships to college. Many colleges organized their financial aid programs along similar lines, ability rather than need being the major criterion (Wing and Wallach 1971; Thresher 1966). The College Entrance Examination Board began its College Scholarship Service in 1954 to counter the rising competition that often resulted in students with promise but with very little need being awarded scholarships. This program has ensured that talented youth selected for CSS awards do in fact have real need for the funds.

By the end of that decade new issues were surfacing. Some scholars began to question previous academic performances as an appropriate, sole measure of social, entrepreneurial, and creative abilities (McClellan 1958). They also called for curricular revision of educational programs to allow a "student to realize his potential within the framework of his own culture" (Astin 1972, p. 24) rather than mere provision of supportive services to enable the disadvantaged, culturally diverse student population to manage traditional coursework (Eels 1953; Gordon 1972a). Recently the practice of searching only for talented, developed students has become unacceptable to minority groups (Lane 1969). They believe higher education has a responsibility to provide educational access and useful experience to all citizens who desire it (Astin 1972; McGrath 1966).

In some states with fairly progressive programs for minority and nontraditional students (for example New York, New Jersey, California and Ohio) significant inroads have been made in admissions practices, even at some of the more prestigious institutions (Pifer 1973; Higher Education 1975). However, provisions to accommodate previously unacceptable students usually relate to outside sources of funding and do not indicate substantive revision of admissions policies.

The sole use of traditional predictors of college success, high school achievement records and SAT scores, has been questioned (for example, by Gordon 1965; Kendrick 1965; Society 1964). These predictors have been studied by numerous researchers (see Gordon 1972a for discussion of the various studies) with general agreement that these measures, particularly past achievement, are not without accuracy in predicting standard success; however, this may work to the exclusion of the disadvantaged student population. These predictors "do not necessarily reveal a person's potential for being influenced by the college experience" (Astin 1972, p. 25). Furthermore, "we should not penalize students for their lack of preparation, but neither should we abolish all standards; to do so would be patronizing in that it would imply that the student is incapable" (Astin 1972, p. 25).

But by using these predictors alone, we have penalized and excluded the poor and/or minority group members, which is antithetical to the ideal of equal opportunity (Rossmann 1975).

Some recent studies that investigated the value of biographical data for predicting college success have suggested using them in evaluating disadvantaged candidates. Nonintellective factors such as family background, income, motivation, and attitude toward education may also be useful, although the use of predictors of success in college may vary with different populations (Gordon 1970; Hills 1965; Willingham 1964; Brown 1964; Garcia 1958; Webb 1960; Rossmann 1975). On the other hand, if enough characteristics and their functions can be identified that differentiate students with respect to their academic needs and strengths, then appropriate kinds of college experiences can be prescribed for individual students. This would mark a change in approach from predictive selection to prescriptive development. Prescriptive development would entail finding that college with the potential to provide the best college experience for a given student. Clearly the criterion for the admission of a disadvantaged student should be his potential to complete a college program.

The use of differential admissions criteria for educationally disadvantaged students apparently is based on the belief that appropriate services (counseling, tutoring, remedial work) can bring the achievement level of these students to that of their regularly admitted counterparts (New York State [1973]). Although they may be educationally disadvantaged, nontraditional students often bring to the college a positive orientation, "street" sophistication, and motivation (Rossmann 1975). Colleges and universities can no longer be allowed to maintain a comfortably homogeneous student population.

Finance

Financial aid is the most critical factor in extending higher education to disadvantaged and minority groups. Progress cannot be made unless substantial amounts of money are available for the support of students in higher education and the programs that serve them. The majority of disadvantaged students are from families with annual incomes of less than $8,000. Their families cannot afford to contribute to the cost of college; in fact, it may be necessary for them to make sacrifices because they are losing the potential financial contribution of the student. Thus the student from a poverty background often has feelings of guilt, feelings that he or she is abandoning the family.

In addition, such a student often cannot afford to participate in the social activities of the college environment and may suffer psychological difficulties as a result. These psychological factors may contribute to lack of success and persistence on the part of the student.

There are positive correlations between attendance and family income and between family income and ethnic group membership (New York State [1973]; CEEB 1973). Costs of education have risen in the past few years but financial aid to students and programs for the disadvantaged have not increased proportionately (CEEB 1973). To further compound the financial problems of poor/minority students, the prestigious institutions with the highest academic standards are those with the largest endowment and scholarship funds (Colvard 1974). Poor students are not likely to meet the admission standards of these institutions because of their inferior elementary and secondary experience, so they attend less selective schools. Because of this they receive little in the way of alumni or private foundation or endowment support, which tends to be concentrated in the more selective institutions.

Federal aid takes the following forms: public scholarships, grants, guaranteed loans, subsidized loans, contingent repayment plans, work-study programs, income tax relief, grants and favorable loans for buildings and equipment, and more general grants to institutions, including operation of low tuition schools by the government. The U.S. Office of Education presently administers five major programs for aiding students; Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study Program, National Defense Student Loans, and Guaranteed Loans. Approximately 25 percent of the nation's postsecondary students have been receiving some form of federal assistance. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act and Social Security plan account for 60 percent of federal aid at private colleges, and 80 percent at public colleges in New York State (University of the State of New York 1974). Despite the existence of these programs, federal aid has not been adequately funded to meet the needs of students who require the most help.

Only the Basic and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, the College Work-Study Program, and the National Defense Student Loan program endowments primarily serve needy students (CEEB 1973). Other federal grants (usually for research) are given to large universities rather than two- or four-year colleges, which enroll the greatest number of disadvantaged students. The amount of federal funds a student receives and the way in which the funds are

packaged (the balance and mixture of grants, loans, etc.) affect college access, choice of institution, and even the quality of educational performance of the student.

There are several other problems that seem to be built into federal programs for financial aid. There are limits on the amount of aid that institutions can supply to individuals; colleges with a large number of disadvantaged students are in a particularly difficult position because of government matching funds requirements; loan funds are limited and low income students must compete with lower risk students for funds; and more funds are distributed to students in the more expensive institutions than to students in the less costly institutions. Although the federal government's efforts to make funds available to institutions and students in need have been great and consequential, adequate support for all students is lacking (CEEB 1973).

At present state aid is providing the most support for disadvantaged students. The type of aid varies from state to state. Some states distribute funds on the basis of need, some on the basis of ability, and some on a combination of these. Some of the best state programs are found in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, California, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and Wisconsin (which makes special provisions for Indian American) (see *Higher Education in the States* (1975) and Boyd (1974) for comprehensive data).

Although recent federal legislation (Education Amendments of 1972) attempts to improve chances for disadvantaged populations to attain higher education, the problems of insufficient funds, inequitable distribution, and inefficient financial aid processes remain the most critical barriers to higher education for the disadvantaged.

Curriculum

No essential change in the overall college curriculum has occurred as a result of the addition of programs for the disadvantaged, although responsive practices have been introduced (Crossland 1971; Astin 1972; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Ruchkin 1972; Gordon 1970). There is a great deal of overlap among the various types of compensatory practices that have been implemented. The following discussion will focus on precollege preparatory programs, ethnic studies, remedial/developmental practices, counseling, tutoring, and study skills training.

Since high school graduation is a prerequisite for attendance at most colleges, precollege preparatory programs have been one of the

most prevalent and successful innovations and it is well to begin a description of compensatory practices with them. Among them can be listed nationwide, federally funded programs such as Upward Bound and the Educational Talent Search program (Tinto 1973). Other programs have been sponsored by private foundations, for example College Bound and A Better Chance (ABC) (Gordon 1972a; Tinto 1973). Examples of noteworthy local programs should include SEEK and the College Discovery Program, both functions of CUNY (Tinto 1973; Dispenzieri 1969a and b); Dillard University's Prefreshman Program (Jennings 1967); the programs at Yale, Columbia, Rutgers, and Bronx Community College's Operation Second Chance. (These and many others are described in Gordon and Wilkerson (1966)).

Precollege preparatory programs typically involve recruitment from high schools, summer sessions on college campuses, and individual, intensive basic skills training. Evaluations of these programs are less than adequate and results are mixed, but generally these programs are considered successful, particularly in altering attitudes and fostering motivation.

Several programs have focused on recruiting and retaining disadvantaged students once they have been admitted. The Special Services Program, federally funded under the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, was directed toward this goal (Davis 1973). Some of the many colleges and universities that have made special efforts in this direction include Northeastern University in Boston, Morgan State University in Maryland, Knoxville College in Tennessee (Gordon and Wilkerson 1966), Michigan State University, New Mexico State University, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater (Tollefson 1973), University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign (Aleamoni 1974), Boston University (Smith 1972), the State of Vermont institutions *(Carnegie Foundation,* 1973), and the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program in North Carolina, a cooperative effort between black colleges and the Institute for Services to Education (Gordon 1972a).

The critical question is what specifically are these institutions doing to help their new recruits? A general pattern of responses is evident. First, the addition of ethnic studies programs is probably the most fundamental curricular change employed by colleges and universities in their attempt to serve the disadvantaged, specially admitted students. The Willie and McCord (1972) survey of black students in white institutions found black students very much in favor of black studies as the most crucial part of their educational ex-

perience. And Oliver (1975) describes a statewide secondary/collegiate effort to develop an ethnic (black) studies program in Alabama. It should be noted that some scholars believe that ethnic studies are and should be of equal importance to traditional students. Some minority students share this view (the subjects in the Astin (1972) survey). Ethnic studies should be incorporated into the curriculum of all departments to give the most comprehensive view of the multicultural nature of our society to all students. The author doubts, however, that this view is shared by many administrators and faculty.

Another prevalent practice among compensatory programs is the inclusion of remedial or developmental coursework (this often overlaps with precollege program practices). At worst, these courses are offered on a noncredit basis, rather like a continuation of high school. Understandably, this practice often demoralizes the new student (Gordon 1967; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Astin 1972; Roueche 1968). Some programs have begun to phase out this type of remedial course (Gordon 1967; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966). But at best, remedial courses have been characterized by innovative instructional techniques, such as a composite of classroom discussion, seminars, individual projects, field research, self-instructional or programmed materials, simulation, audio-visual instruction, study abroad, independent study, and interdisciplinary study. These are also some of the best techniques that have been used with the traditional student population. When compensatory, remedial courses are designed to meet the individual student where he is and build on his strengths, they facilitate his growth and transition into regular coursework.

Counseling, both vocational and personal, is characteristic of many of the programs for the disadvantaged. The literature that exists is not encouraging and quite equivocal. Astin (1972) cites several cases in which students either lost interest in the counseling facilities after a short time in the programs or expressed lack of interest from the outset. Rossmann, Astin et al. (1975) in their report of CUNY nontraditional students found that if students receive personal counseling there was a greater likelihood of attrition on their part. The Gordon (1972a) survey findings support Rossmann's in regard to the inefficiency of current counseling procedures for disadvantaged students. The Willie and McCord (1972) survey accounts show ambiguous findings regarding black students' attitudes toward black counselors. The author has observed negative attitudes toward counselors exhibited by nontraditional students, apparently the result of high school experiences, and suggests a change in approach from traditional techniques to "advocacy" for the disadvantaged student. It

81 19

should be pointed out that findings indicative of failure of traditional counseling with disadvantaged students are not inconsistent with findings regarding counseling failure with regular students (Gordon 1969b).

Tutoring is an important feature of most programs for the disadvantaged. Research is more encouraging here, yet still conflicting and ambiguous. Astin (1972) and Rossmann (1975) found no evidence to support the value of tutoring. Other studies, however, have found evidence of its usefulness. Peer tutoring was reported a successful practice at Miami-Dade Junior College (Miami-Dade 1972), Northeast Missouri College, Kirksville (Wright 1971), and the Learning Center at the College of San Mateo (Wenrich 1971). Gordon (1972a) reported differing tutorial approaches and differing student reactions. Approaches included student tutors, paid tutors and faculty tutors, and students responded according to the tutor's personal characteristics and attitudes. For example, older peer tutors whose backgrounds were as disadvantaged as their tutees were effective in several of the responding institutions.

Study Skills Centers have also shown promise in the education of the disadvantaged (Gordon 1972a). These typically involve such features as seminars in note taking, preparing fo. exams, and assessing instructor styles and goals. Beitler and Martin (1971) reported a successful program in study skills training at the New York City Community College.

Outcomes

The literature on educational outcomes is sparse for those researchers interested in and concerned about the status of programs for the disadvantaged. Like preschool programs, collegiate compensatory programs have failed to document the design as well as the implementation. Also, systematic data collection and analysis have been infrequent (Tinto 1973; CEEB 1973). The appropriateness of success of compensatory programs cannot be determined from the enthusiasm with which they were begun or the speed with which the practices spread. The crucial question is what aspect of the program actually accounted for successes or failures? Often programs were born out of political expediency either because institutions felt political pressure or because money became available if they would institute compensatory programs (Tinto 1973; Rossman 1975). When outcomes failed to meet the expectations of administrators it was often forgotten that the lack of careful planning and clearly set goals have contributed more to failure than any lack of merit on the part of the educationally disadvantaged students. Staff for the compensatory programs were often quickly and therefore inappropriately chosen in the institutions' efforts to initiate special programs as rapidly as possible. As stated in the Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) study, little heed was paid to the compatibility of the intentions of special program staff and the intentions of the institution. Thus incongruence in goals often caused serious conflicts between administrators of the special programs and other university administrators. The program staff usually supported activist ideals not always espoused by the institution as a whole. Without tenure or other security, the incidence of staff turnover was quite high in special programs, which added another element of instability to these efforts (Astin 1972). In essence, the creators of compensatory programs neglected to address the issue of systematically changing the structure of the institution. The programs were often little more than political concessions, structural appendages without firm theoretical underpinnings, without well-thought-out practical foundations, and set apart from the main institutional process.

Funds necessary for effective program evaluation have yet to be appropriated for special programs. Agencies conducting evaluations from the outside sometimes evolve data quite different from that re-

05 21

ported by the program participants. Most of the data are, in fact, narrative, self-reported descriptions. Self-evaluation is characterized by subjectivity in the absence of personnel trained in the methods of empirical evaluation.

Additionally, fears surrounding program evaluation have precluded or hindered sincere efforts in this direction. Program staff have felt threatened by evaluation because it seemed an indication of doubt regarding program effectiveness. In fact, evaluation at times preceded withdrawal of financial support or institutional backing. Institutional commitment to evaluation has been inconsistent and sometimes nonexistent. A primary reason is institutional unwillingness to deal with any inadequacies in these special programs, which would require extra expenditures for revisions or additional planning and valuable university manpower (Tinto 1973).

For evaluation of special programs to attain credence, criteria and procedures need careful planning. One of the most important areas to be examined is a program's ability to help a substantial number of its students complete the university's requirements for a degree. Prior to actual evaluation, a proper assessment of the items that are to be evaluated must be determined. These should include not only student performance but also program practices that may indicate effectiveness. The staff's interaction with students, the courses offered, the support services of counseling and tutoring all affect success with special students. Neither the program nor the institution should fear the discovery of lack of quality in their practices, for without feedback it becomes impossible to improve effectiveness or justify changes in procedures and practices to reach important goals.

To attain the sound evaluation necessary to determine and maintain program effectiveness, efforts must begin at the program level with stringent evaluation techniques and practices as part of the ongoing program process. To meet these needs, graduate and professional schools need to research and develop programs for training persons in this field as researchers, evaluators, and practitioners. Properly trained personnel with a commitment to proper evaluation are extremely crucial for special program survival. The product of evaluation efforts will be a critical factor, since this information assists legislators and foundations who fund these programs and periodically judge their effectiveness.

Even though collegiate programs for the disadvantaged have not been evaluated properly or adequately, general statements regarding outcomes can be made and new questions can be raised. Generally, the performance of nontraditional students has been comparable to

regularly enrolled students. Attrition rates have also been comparable, if not somewhat lower, for nontraditional students (see Gordon 1972a; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Astin 1972; Rossman 1975; Tinto 1973).

These findings must be qualified on several counts. Some institutions have made deliberate attempts to retain their nontraditional students, realizing that adjustment to college academic work is usually accomplished during the first two years of college. Universities have felt the need to help these students reduce their anxiety and alleviate their fears of failure and build an adequate social, psychological, and educational support system for subsequent years. Often nontraditional students' grade-point averages have been based on less than a full course load (Astin 1972; New York State 1973). However, the extent to which this condition has compromised the validity of comparison of averages is questionable given the multitude of variables affecting the averages of both groups. Also, some faculty have established less stringent standards of performance for nonstandard students purely out of a patronizing attitude toward this clientele. Thus, the issue of achievement is confounded.

Perhaps one of the most important outcomes of collegiate compensatory programs is the evidence they give of postsecondary education's weakness in dealing with student diversities. The realization of the complexity of compensatory education has caused many educators to pause and reflect on how best to reverse the negative impacts of early educational and economic deprivation, social isolation, and ethnic discrimination. The problem is not simply pedagogical but involves family life and community life as well. As the breadth and complexity of the problem becomes clearer, so does the pedagogical issue and its interrelationship with these other factors. The pedagogical issue has to do with an awareness of the many ways learning takes place in diverse populations and the application of this awareness to follow optimum educational development on the part of students who have different backgrounds, opportunities, values, and patterns of intellectual and social functioning. Other considerations are the identification of academic standards and goals, and the influence of such factors as intervention by dedicated instructors and other students, as well as intangible factors such as the atmosphere of the university.

Compensatory education, in contrast to traditional higher education, has attempted to shift the responsibility for learning more toward the teacher than the student. In this context effective education is a product of the match between learner characteristics, the learn-

ing environment, and the learning tasks (Hunt 1961). More accurate measurement of academic success may be the key to making the basic educational process more meaningful for compensatory programs. There is emerging interest in the use of instruments to assess the learning process as well as the level of achievement. It is increasingly recognized that general approaches to remedial or tutorial help are less likely to be effective than those targeted at specific aspects of learning. However, an examination of existing instruments and strategies for assessing student achievement reveals that few are effective in elucidating process, and that most present special problems when used with minority groups (Samuda 1975).

There has been a tendency to separate affective development from cognitive development. For a young child the mastery of a skill can enhance his feelings of confidence and create positive expectations that will aid future learning. When this process is hindered, as it so often is with the disadvantaged student, special care must be taken to redesign educational programs from early education through college to compensate for this loss of confidence. At the elementary and secondary levels special care should be taken to ensure that teachers attend to children's affective needs, their individual learning style, and their learning strengths and weaknesses. At the college level, attention should be given to the development of any basic skill that has not been developed.

Many (Gordon, Astin, for example) believe that the university needs to redefine its role in society and its responsibility for the education of all its members, whether or not they fit the traditional college student model. Institutional nonresponsiveness to change not only affects the nontraditional student but all other students as well. In many cases it has been the compensatory program and its struggle for survival that has brought the problems, and some solutions, to the fore. For example, financial support is beginning to be seen as a necessity for the middle income student as well as the low income student in view of rising costs of higher education and the current economic situation in the U.S. In curriculum, innovations such as tutorials and study skills centers, originally designed for the poorly prepared special student, are now seen as valuable techniques from which many traditional students can benefit.

Traditional admissions policies have been questioned because of the special needs and demands of compensatory programs. The type of student that the special programs seek does not meet the usual admissions criteria. His poor high school preparation and low achievement scores eliminate him if regular admissions procedures

are followed. However, this problem is not limited to minority students. Many other students are beginning to fall into this category, such as older persons and those returning to school for retraining. Thus there is a need for institutions to reexamine their admissions criteria. An alternative approach is the use of external degree programs such as the Urban League Street Academy in New York City (secondary level).

Little attention has been given to the overall appropriateness of contemporary education. Yet the emphasis on educational alternatives and compensatory education may require a basic change in institutions. Although it is easier to add extensions than to alter basic structures, clearly the best interests of disadvantaged students and compensatory education will be served when the quality of the mainstream programs and services of our schools is improved.

If higher education is to be democratized and made accessible to all segments of the population, the form and content of its offerings will have to be changed. There are several areas where change is needed. Unless postsecondary institutions are geographically accessible, many segments of the population will be left out (Crossland 1971). But physical access may not be as important as political considerations, since if the idea of equal access is not politically acceptable to the communities from which the students come, democratization will not take place. Higher education must have a change in image that is clearly articulated and reflects a desire to serve previously excluded clienteles.

Since wide differences exist in the characteristics and needs of diverse populations, the options available to students must be plentiful. They must range from traditional liberal arts and preprofessional programs to career orientations to open-ended and continuing education. The content of coursework will need to reflect the interests and values of people whose purposes significantly vary. The manner in which learning occurs or is available must include formal, informal, and incidental experiences. In other words, democratized higher education in a pluralistic society must include multipurpose institutions that provide variable routes by which continuting education can occur.

Conclusions

Given the confused state of compensatory education at the collegiate level and the equivocal status of evaluation efforts, what may be said that is useful to practitioners and policy makers in this field? Despite the fact that good evaluation studies in this area have been few and the findings contradictory, it does appear that some conclusions may be drawn.

1. Where programs have been implemented with full systems of student support services, special opportunity students showed equal or higher grade-point averages than regular students of comparable ability and showed equal or higher retention rates than regular students (New York State Department of Education 1975; Rossmann 1975; Baehr 1969; Bridge 1970; Christensen 1971; Losak and Burns 1971; Smith 1972).

2. Where programs with full systems of student support services have been implemented special opportunity students show increased self-esteem and motivation (Maykovich 1970; Davis 1973; Gordon 1972a; Hunt and Hardt 1969).

3. Where special opportunity students are selected on the basis of previously demonstrated talent (good but not excellent high school academic average and/or moderately good college entrance exam scores), college completion rates exceed those of traditional college population and grade-point averages are comparable to those of traditional college populations (Clark and Plotkin 1963; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966).

4. If college completion is the criterion, high college admission test scores account for relatively little of the variance, since students completing college come in fairly equal numbers from the full range of scores (Astin 1969).

5. In programs for special opportunity students, where little systematic student support service is available or utilized, student achievement, retention rates, and graduation are low (Lavin and Jacobson 1973; Rosen 1973).

Although the state of the art is quite varied, some programs or program elements are emerging that show promise. Among these are:

1. Full systems of student support services that include:

- Financial aid, including necessary allowances for tuition, room and board, incidental expenses, and contributions to family support

where necessary. The aid package may consist of Basic Opportunity Grant, loan, university grant, family contribution, and income from work

- Adjusted curriculum in which the special needs of the student are taken into account in planning course work
- Tutorial support
- Remediation where necessary, and
- Counseling and continuous social/psychological support (Gordon 1972a; New York State Department of Education 1975; Davis 1973; McDill 1969).

2. Many students, particularly special opportunity students, need to be protected from the impersonal atmosphere of the large university and provided with more intensive, small group, personal contact with faculty. A successful example has been described by Smith (1972). This program includes team teaching, core curriculum, extensive guidance counseling, and a highly student-centered orientation. The frequently reported success of tutorials (faculty and peer) is probably related to the personalization of the college learning experience. (See Miami-Dade 1972; Wright 1971; Wenrich 1971).

3. Traditional remedial courses seem relatively ineffective, but targeted remediation based on specific identified needs appears to be an effective approach. Such a program has been developed and implemented by John Monroe (Gordon 1972a) and includes, among other elements, special attention to 1,000-essential-words college vocabulary (without mastery of which students are known to fail), and to information processing skills in which the emphasis is placed on evaluating the differential quality of various kinds of information and information sources.

4. Student motivation, retention, and achievement can be enhanced through full service programs that also give attention to the sociopolitical life of students. A program rich in all these elements has been described by Lopate (Gordon 1972a) and has as principal features, in addition to standard elements, a strong student advocacy stance and close, extensive ties to the third-world elements in the communities from which special opportunity students come.

5. Behavior modification or shaping—a method of altering attitudes and behaviors by means of positive and negative reinforcement —has been utilized with some success in promoting academic achievement and retention in college (Ruchkin 1972).

6. The introduction of course content that complements the nationalistic concerns of students has been widely utilized. Its direct impact on achievement has not been well documented, but its effect on

student attitudes seems positive. For examples see Gordon (1972a) and Oliver (1975).

7. Since the test-taking behavior and study habits of many special opportunity students are weak, special attention to the development of these skills has been included in some programs. One of the early models for programs including these elements has been described by Froe (1966).

8. It is increasingly recognized that the problems of special opportunity students predate their admission to college. Several programs designed to prepare and aid adolescents in the transition from high school to college have been developed. Among these alternative schools, the best examples are the street academies (see Carpenter 1972). Other public school programs are described by Shaycroft (1967), Wessmann (1969 and 1973), Hawkridge (1968).

Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current research literature on higher education for publication in the National Institute of Education's monthly *Resources in Education* (RIE). Readers who wish to order ERIC documents cited in the bibliography should write to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Post Office Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the ERIC document (ED) number. Unless otherwise noted, documents are available in both microfiche (MF) and hard/photocopy (HC).

Aleamoni, L. M. and Bowers, J. E. "The Evaluation of a Special Education Opportunities Program for Disadvantaged College Students." *Research in Higher Education* 1 (1974): 151-164.

Armstrong, B. *Factors in the Formulation of College Programs for Negroes.* Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, 1939.

Astin, A. W. "The Folklore of Selectivity." *Saturday Review,* December 20, 1969.

Astin, H. S., et al. *Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student.* Washington, D.C.: Human Service Press, 1972.

Baehr, R. F. *Project Success.* Final Report, December 1969. Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, 1969. ED 039 870. MF-$0.76; HC-$3.32.

Beitler, L. and Martin I. "The Design and Implementation of a Learning Center for Career Oriented Students." Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Tampa, December 1971. ED 056 850. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Bowles, F. and DeCosta, F. A. *Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education.* Hightstown, N.J. 08520: McGraw-Hill, 1971. ED 088 330. Not available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Boyd, Joseph D. "1974-75 Undergraduate State Scholarship/Grant Survey." Deerfield, Ill.: National Association of State Scholarship Programs, October 1974. Mimeograph.

Bridge, W. T., ed. "Research and Compensatory Education: What are We Doing?" Proceedings of a workshop sponsored by the Florida Educational Research Association, Jacksonville, January 1970. ED 041 581. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.

Brown, W. M. and Russell, R. D. "Limitations of Admissions Testing for the Disadvantaged." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43 (1964): 301-04.

Carnegie Foundation. "Education for 'New' Students: How's It's Done in Vermont." *Carnegie Quarterly* 21 (Fall 1973): 1-3.

Carpenter, E. F. "Harlem Prep: An Alternative System of Education." In *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners,* edited by A. H. Passow. NY: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Cartter, A., ed. *Higher Education in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Center for Policy Research. *Postsecondary Education and the Disadvantaged.* Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, Bureau of Research, 1969. ED 034 839. MF-$0.76; HC-$6.97.

Cheek, K. V. "The Philosophical Justification for Black Colleges in a Multiracial Society." Address before the American Association for Higher Education, 27th National Conference, March 1972. ED 061 871. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Christensen, F. A. "The Development of an Academic Support System for Educationally Disadvantaged Students." Paper presented at the APGA meeting, Atlantic City, 1971. ED 050 211. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Clark, K. B. and Plotkin, L. *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges.* NY: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963.

Coleman, J., et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington: DHEW, Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1966. ED 012 275. MF-$0.76; HC-$12.06.

College Entrance Examination Board. *Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education. Report on the Panel on Financing Low-Income Minority Students in Higher Education.* NY: CEEB, 1973. ED 077 463. MF-$0.76; HC-$4.43.

Colvard, R. and Bennett, A. M. *Patterns of Concentration in Large Foundations' Grants to U.S. Colleges and Universities.* Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1974.

Cornell University. *Charting the Second Century Under the Land-Grant Philosophy of Education.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Crossland, F. E. *Minority Access to College.* NY: Schocken Books, 1971.

Davis, J. A., et al. "The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students." Princeton, N.J.:

Educational Testing Service draft to the Office of Education, 1973. Mimeograph.

Dispenzieri, A., et al. *The College Discovery Program: A Synthesis of Research.* NY: CUNY, Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs, 1969a. ED 041 070. MF-$0.76; HC-$4.43.

———. *Characteristics of SEEK Program Students: September 1968 Entering Class.* NY: CUNY, Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs, 1969b. ED 041 069. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.

Eels, K. "Some Implications for School Practices of the Chicago Studies of Cultural Bias in Intelligence Tests." *Higher Education Review* 23 (1953): 284-97.

Froe, O. D. "Meeting the Needs of College Youth: the Morgan State College Program." *Journal of Negro Education* 35 (1966): 422-29.

Garcia, D. and Wigham, N. "Validity of SSHA Administered Before and After College Experience." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 8 (1958): 845-51.

Gordon, E. W. *Opportunities in Higher Education for Socially Disadvantaged Youth. From High School to College: Readings for Counselors.* NY: CEEB, 1965.

——— and Wilkerson, D. A. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged.* NY: CEEB, 1966.

———. "Transition from School to College. A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research* 40 (February 1970): 151-79.

———, et al. "Report of the Study of Collegiate Compensatory Programs for Disadvantaged Youth." 1972a. Unpublished.

———. "Perspectives on Counseling and Other Approaches to Behavioral Change." Paper delivered at the invitation of the Division of Counseling Psychology, New York, 1972b.

Hawkridge, D. G., et al. *A Study of Selected Exemplary Programs for the Education of Disadvantaged Children.* Final Report, Project 089013. Parts I and II. Palo Alto: DHEW, 1968. ED 023 776. MF-$0.76; HC-$5.70. ED 023 777. MF-$0.76; HC-$17.13.

Higher Education in the States 5 (1975): 1-24.

Hills, J. R. *Admissions Procedures that Make Sense.* Research in Higher Education, NY: CEEB, 1965.

Hunt, D. E. and Hardt, R. H. "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Achievement of Negro Students." *Journal of Social Issues* 25 (1969): 117-129.

Hunt, J. McV. *Intelligence and Experience.* New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Irwin, N. ed. *Higher Education in the United States.* Washington: American Council on Education, 1961.

Jaffe, A., et al. *Ethnic Higher Education—Negro Colleges in the 60's.* NY: Praeger, 1968.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. "The American Negro College." *Higher Education Review* 37 (Winter 1967): 3-60.

Jennings, F. S. "For Such a Tide Is Moving . . ." In *Education for the Disadvantaged,* edited by A. H. Passow. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Karabel, J. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." In *Educating the Disadvantaged,* edited by E. Flaxman. NY: AMS Press, 1973.

Kendrick, S. A. "College Board Scores and Cultural Bias." *College Board Review* 55 (Winter 1964-65): 7-9.

Lane, H. "The Black Agenda for Higher Education." *College Board Review* 67 (Spring 1969): 6-20.

Lavin, D. E. and Jacobsen, B. "Open Admissions at the City University of New York: A Description of Academic Outcomes after Three Semesters." April 1973. ED 078 808. MF-$0.76; HC-$6.97.

Losak, J. and Burns, N. *An Evaluation of the Community College Studies Program for the Year 1969-70.* Miami: Miami-Dade Junior College, 1971. ED 056 683. MF-$0.76; HC-$5.70.

McCellan, D. C., et al. *Talent and Society.* Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1956.

McDill, et al. *Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

McGrath, E. J. *Universal Higher Education.* NY: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Maykovich, M. K. *Black, Asian and White Students in the Educational Opportunity Program.* Washington: National Center for Educational Research Development, DHEW, 1970. ED 073 220. MF-$0.76; HC-$5.70.

Miami-Dade Junior College. *The Peer Teaching Program of Community College Students.* Miami-Dade Junior College, March 1972. ED 060 837. MF-$0.76; HC-$3.32.

New York State. "Higher Educational Opportunity Program." Final report 1972-73. [1973.] Unpublished manuscript. ED 086 045. MF-$0.76; HC-$5.70.

New York State Department of Education, Higher Education Opportunity. *Guidelines for the Submission of Grant Proposals for Fiscal Year 1974-75.* Albany: New York State Department of Education, 1975.

Oliver, L. W. "Ethnic Heritage Studies Program." Birmingham: Miles College, Albama Center for Higher Education, 1975. Unpublished.

Pifer, A. *The Higher Education of Blacks in the United States.* Alfred and Winifred Memorial Lecture for 1973, Johannesburg, South Africa, August 1973. NY: Carnegie Corp., 1973.

Regents of the University of the State of New York. *Minority Access to and Participation in Postsecondary Education.* Position Paper No. 15. Albany: State Education Department, 1972. ED 065 051. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Rosen, D., et al. "Open Admissions: The Promise and the Lie of Open Access to American Education." 1973. ED 082 603. MF-$0.76; HC-$9.51.

Rossmann, J. E., Astin, A. W., et al. *Open Admissions at the City University of New York. An Analysis of the First Year.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Roueche, J. E. *Salvage, Redirection or Custody?* Los Angeles: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. ED 019 077. MF-$0.76; HC-$4.43.

Ruchkin, J. P. *Selected Issues in Collegiate Compensatory Education.* In *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners* edited by A. H. Passow. NY: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Samuda, R. J. "Racial Discrimination Through Mental Testing: A Social Critic's Point of View." *IRCD Bulletin* 42 (May 1973): 1-16.

Shaycroft, M. F., et al. *The High School Years. Growth in Cognitive Skills.* Interim Report 3 to the U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project 3051. Pittsburgh: Project Talent Office, American Institutes for Research and the University of Pittsburgh, 1967.

Smith, G. M. "The Two-Year Compensatory Program of the College of Basic Studies: Implications of a Successful Model." In *On Equality of Educational Opportunity,* edited by F. Mosteller and D. P. Moynihan. NY: Vintage, 1972. ED 012 661. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.58.

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. *Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children. Journal of Social Issues* 20 (1964): 129-45.

Thresher, B. A. *College Admissions and the Public Interest.* NY: CEEB, 1966. ED 081 400. MF-$0.76; HC-$4.43.

Tinto, V. and Sherman, R. H. *The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Educational Intervention Programs: A Critical Review of the Research.* NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1974. ED 101 042. MF-$0.76; HC-$6.97.

Tollefson, A. L. *College Student Development in Evolution—with*

Special Focus on the Disadvantaged. Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973. ED 082 632. MF-$0.76; HC-$8.24.

U.S. Department of Commerce. *Detailed Statistics: 1970 Census of the Population.* Washington: Superintendent of Documents. Government Printing Office, 1970.

University of the State of New York. *Financial Aid for New York State Students.* Albany: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, March 1974. ED 090 867. MF-$0.76; HC-$6.97.

Urban Ed. Inc. *Minority Enrollment and Representation in Institutions of Higher Education.* NY: Ford Foundation, 1974. ED 100 194. MF-$0.76; HC-$14.59.

Webb, S. C. "The Comparative Validity of Two Biographical Inventory Keys." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 44 (1960): 178-83.

Wenrich, J. W., et al. *Keeping Dropouts In: Retention of Students Identified as High Probability Dropouts.* Washington: DHEW, March 1971. ED 047 684. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.

Wessman, A. E. "Evaluation of Project ABC (A Better Chance). An Evaluation of Dartmouth College-Independent Schools Scholarship Program for Disadvantaged High School Students." 1969. ED 031 549. MF-$0.76; HC-$18.40.

———. "Scholastic and Psychological Effects of a Compensatory Education Program for Disadvantaged High School Students: Project ABC." In *Educating the Disadvantaged,* edited by E. Flaxman. NY: AMS Press, 1973.

Willie, C. V. and McCord, A. S. *Black Students at White Colleges.* NY: Praeger, 1972.

Willingham, W. W. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, 1964. NY: CEEB, 1964.

Wing, C. W. and Wallach, M. A. *College Admissions and the Psychology of Talent.* NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Wright, R. M. *The Effects of Organized Tutoring and Advising by Upperclassmen with "Predicted Unsuccessful" Freshmen.* Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, National Center for Educational Research and Development, July 1971. ED 059 696. MF-$0.76; HC-$1.95.

1974 Reports Still Available

The "Benefits Crisis" in Higher Education
Oscar T. Lenning

Proprietary Schools and Postsecondary Education
David Trivett

How Much Change for a Dollar? A Look at Title III
Harold L. Hodgkinson

Higher Education and the Steady State
Larry L. Leslie and Howard F. Miller, Jr.

The Personalized System of Instruction: An Educational Alternative
Robert S. Ruskin

Faculty Workload: Facts, Myths and Commentary
Harold E. Yuker

Trends in Education for the Professions
G. Lester Anderson

Time Shortened Degrees
Charles W. Meinert

Private Colleges: Present Conditions and Future Prospects
Carol Herrnstadt Shulman

College Trustees: A Question of Legitimacy
J. L. Zwingle and William V. Mayville

Copies of any of the titles listed above are available for $3 each. To order, write to the Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D. C. 20036. Payment must accompany all orders under $15.